

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 27 April 2004. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 17, 18 and 19 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and Claim 1 has been amended to also clarify the combination of elements that form the invention of the subject Patent Application. Additionally, Claims 2, 5-7 and 11-16 have been cancelled by this Amendment.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Drawings under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.83(a), 1.84(p)(5). The Examiner stated that the reference sign 44 and the structure associated therewith that was claimed in Claims 11-13, was not shown in the Drawings.

The subject flanges have been deleted from the Claims, Claims 11-13 having been cancelled, and the Specification has been amended to remove the discussion of the flanges and their associated reference numerals. Therefore, no changes to the Drawings are now required.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification under 37 C.F.R. § 1.71, for not disclosing where the corresponding flanges of the resilient member and the handle are located and how they function. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended to remove the reference to the flanges and also to correct a number of informalities found therein. As the subject matter has been cancelled from the Claims, there is no requirement for any discussion of the

flanges to be included in the Specification. No new matter has been added to the Specification by these changes.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 and 5-7 due to informalities therein. Claims 5-7 have been cancelled by this Amendment and Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 2 and 5 therein. The informalities kindly noted by the Examiner have been corrected in amended Claim 1.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3, 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner indicated that it was not clear what guiding edge was referred to in Claim 3. Therefore, Claim 3 has been amended to correct the inadvertent reference to the guiding edge (24) and replaced it with the proper reference to the holding block (14). Thus, it is now believed that the Claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 4, and 8-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Chu, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0068874. However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claims 5 and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner further

indicated that Claims 6 and 17-19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 2 and 5 therein, thereby effectively rewriting the subject matter of Claim 5 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, Claim 1 and the only intervening claim, Claim 2. Further, by the cancellation of 11-16 the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs, has been overcome. As Claim 1 should now be allowable, all of the Claims dependent thereon are therefore also allowable for at least the same reasons.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: *23 July 2004*

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678